DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 950 EA 003 070

TITLE	[Dropout Prevention Program. Request for Proposal #2.]
INSTITUTION	Texarkana School District 7, Ark.
PUB DATE	30 Jun 70
GRANT	OEG-0-9-130045-3360(281)
NOTE	77p.; OE Performance Contract Project and Rapid Learning Centers Program.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.95
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement, Bids, Cognitive Objectives, Data Analysis, *Dropout Prevention, Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Techniques, Individualized Instruction, Instructional Programs, Mathematics, *Performance Contracts, Performance Criteria, Programed Materials, *Program Proposals, Reading, Testing
IDENTIFIERS	Arkansas, *Texarkana

ABSTRACT

This document provides the necessary instructions and forms for submission of a rapid learning center performance contract propcsal as part of a 4-year dropout prevention program. Contract performance proposals are to embody mathematics and/or reading, and to involve students enrolled in grades 7-12 who are two or more grade levels deficient in mathematics and/or reading. Three sections outline the procedures to be followed by prospective bidders. The statement of work section outlines the general purpose of the proposed learning centers, the student achievement performance required, the performance and measurement, and the method of contractor reimbursement, and incorporates a list of general and special conditions to be met by bidders. The evaluation design section contains summary charts showing performance objectives, measurement instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques, and data analysis presentations. The last section contains the proposal and budget format. (MLF)

ED043950

EA 003 070

OEG-0-9-130045-3360 (281)
RFP #2

Dear Sir:

You and/or your institution are invited to submit a proposal in response to the enclosed Request for Proposal, as set forth in the Statement of Work described in Attachment I. These services will constitute the operation of Rapid Learning Centers offering programs in the areas of mathematics and/or reading. Approximately 300 students deficient by 2 or more grade levels in reading and/or mathematics will participate in the programs to be offered during the school year 1970-71. The contractor will be required to maximize student performance in the areas of mathematics and/or reading achievement within time and cost constraints. A fixed price plus incentive and penalty fee or modified performance incentive contract will be specified. This contract, with the period of performance beginning on September 15, 1970 through June 30, 1971 will be an integral part of a four year project titled "Drop out Prevention", which will be conducted by the Texarkana, U.S.A. school districts represented by Texarkana Arkansas School District #7 designated as the Local Education Agency (LEA).

The target population for the second year of the program will be students enrolled in grades 7-12 and 2 grade levels or more deficient in mathematics and/or reading. The majority of these students will be in grades 7-9. Some of these students will have participated in the Rapid Learning Centers, which have been operated during the school year 1969-70 under the Texarkana, U.S.A. Dropout Prevention Project.

Participants in the instructional program solicited by this RFP will be released from regular classroom instruction for approximately one hour per day per subject matter area. Instruction will occur in existing classroom facilities and/or portable units located near the school in which the students are presently enrolled. Modern mathematics is presently being taught in the Texarkana, Arkansas and Liberty Eylau participating schools.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

One of the long range goals of the Dropout Prevention Program, now in its second phase, is to increase the efficiency of the instructional programs in junior and senior high schools. Hence, the objectives included in the evaluation design which has been constructed for the second phase must be adhered to in the contractor's response to this RFP. (See attachment II).

The contractor's substantive and cost proposals must follow the cutline in Attachment III, Proposal and Budget format. All cost information will be enclosed in a separately sealed envelope with the date of submission of the RFP typed on the upper right hand corner. Only suggested methods of contractor payment and proposed cost reimbursement formula will be described in the substantive narrative of the proposal. No actual prices should be quoted in the main body of the narrative.

A contractor award will be made to the organization whose proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the LEA, or, if all proposals are unacceptable, the LEA may reject all proposals, soliciting others without obligations to procedures and parties previously involved. Criteria for evaluating contractors' proposals are described in Attachment IV, Proposal Selection Criteria. The LEA reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and at any time after closing date of proposal submission to conduct negotiations to the extent the LEA deems necessary and appropriate. If the funding levels are altered, the LEA reserves the right to negotiate a modified program and/or call for new proposals. However, the proposals should be submitted with regard to the criteria for evaluation, capabilities of bidder, and commitment of the organization to meet the contingencies inherent in this performance contracting approach. Once the contractor's bid has been submitted only the LEA can initiate renegotiations.

All letters of intention to bid should be received by the LEA by no later than July 27, 1970, 5:00 p.m. Central Daylight Savings Time. Technical questions pertaining to the substance of this Request for Proposals, as well as contractual questions should be directed to:

Mr. Martin Filogamo, Project Director
Phone: AC 501 772-7511

Proposals are due on August 17, 1970 at the LEA Office, 1500 Jefferson Avenue, Texarkana, Arkansas by 12:00 p.m. noon, Central Daylight Savings Time.

This letter of transmittal or its attachments should not be construed as a commitment on the part of the LEA.

Sincerely,

Edward D. Trice

Edward D. Trice, Superintendent, Arkansas School District #7
LEA Designee

ATTACHMENT I

STATEMENT OF WORK

I. General Purpose of the Proposed Learning Centers

The Texarkana Dropout Prevention Program is a unique management innovation in education which (1) a private company has been placed under contract to do a special instructional job in the public schools, and (2) the private company will be paid according to the results produced under a performance contract. The concept of accountability for results is the basic principle of this venture.

The overall plan for 1969-70 was for Dorsett Educational Systems, Inc. of Norman, Oklahoma to operate several rapid learning systems and to provide instruction for students that had been identified as potential dropouts. Most of the students participated in two class periods each day in the rapid learning centers. Some of the students were in the program two consecutive hours while other students' attendance was interspersed throughout the day. The students in the rapid learning center group spent the remainder of their daily schedule (four class periods) in regular classes. The rapid learning center program was entirely individualized with a multimedia approach using audio-visual machines, programmed materials, and behavioral management techniques.

The long range goals of the Texarkana Dropout Prevention Program are:

1. To significantly reduce the percentage of dropouts in the Texarkana and Liberty Eylau school districts.
2. To increase academic achievement and skill development of students who are educationally deficient.
3. To increase the cost-effectiveness of the instructional program in the Texarkana and Liberty Eylau school districts.

II. Performance Required

A. The contractor shall be required to maximize student achievement performance for an estimated 300 secondary school students who are deficient two or more grade levels in reading and/or mathematics. The contractor shall operate under the following time and costs constraints:

1. The student will be available to the contractor for 45 to 60 minutes per day per subject matter area.

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

2. The student will be available to the contractor for a maximum of 150 days or to the end of the school year (5/27/71). There may be students who participate in this program for only one semester, therefore, these students will only be available to the contractor for a maximun of 75 or 80 days.

B. The contractor shall guarantee that not more than five percent of the students enrolled in the program will drop out of the program during the school year. The definition of a program dropout, and compensations and penalties for such students are outlined in the Special Conditions, section VI.

III. Measurement of Performance

The reliability and validity of test instruments are critical issues in performance contracting. Standardized tests, if used alone, are inadequate for the measurement of individual student progress for contractor payment. This fact is particularly true in reading and mathematics. Therefore, the LEA will pay particular attention to the bidder's instructional program; the use of behaviorally defined, objectives; and the levels of guarantee that the contractor is willing to stipulate. However, the LEA will accept the use of standardized tests for partial payment purposes.

The measurement of performance will be based on two criteria (a) the results of standardized tests and, (b) the extent the contractor achieves performance objectives (both interim and final).

A. Procedures

1. Three standardized test(s) used to measure performance will be selected by the Project Manager and approved by the Internal Evaluators from the nationally standardized tests generally available to the school market. The project manager will have authority over all pre and post testing conditions. He will determine when the tests will be given and which tests will be given to individual students. The contractor will not be told what test or what forms of the test have

been or will be used for each student.

2. The internal evaluator of the LEA will be responsible to supervise the administration and scoring of the tests; and continued review and analysis of all material used by the contractor in the program. The internal evaluator will be responsible for analyzing the test results and submitting the analysis to the project manager.

3. The contractor shall provide a list of interim and final performance objectives for his instructional program in reading and mathematics. The objectives must stipulate the individual student achievement level guaranteed and the time required to achieve them.

4. The contractor must submit to the project manager a pool of criterion-referenced test items that can be used to measure the interim and final performance objectives. At least five (5) times the number of items to be used for testing must be submitted and approved by the internal evaluator fifteen (15) days after initation of the program or by October 5, 1970, which ever is earlier.

5. The project manager or his designee will then randomly select items from the item pool to build an instrument to measure the interim and final performance objectives. The instruments will be certified by the Education Audit contractor.

IV. Method of Contractor Reimbursement

A. Basis of payment

1. Determination of total payment to the contractor will be based on the (a) achievement gain made by each student on the standardized tests, and (b) extent each student achieved the interim and final performance objectives.

2. Seventy-five percent (75%) of total payment will be based on the results of the standardized tests and twenty-five percent (25%) of total payment will be based on the results of student achievement

of interim and final performance objectives.

B. Formula for payment

1. The contractor shall submit a formula for payment with incentives and penalties, for guaranteed achievement gains as indicated by pre and post test scores on standardized tests.

2. The contractor shall submit a formula for payment, with incentives and penalties, for guaranteed attainment as indicated on the instrument used to measure the interim and final performance objectives.

3. All proposed formulas, including guarantees, costs, fees, incentives, and penalties, should be stated on a per individual student basis.

C. Format for reporting formula payment

For the sake of uniformity, all potential contractors are required to report all costs and guarantees on the following format. The form on the following page should be used.

FORMAT FOR REPORTING FORMULA PAYMENT

I. INTERIM PAYMENT

Interim Performance Objectives (Submitted by Contractor)	Fixed Price Proposal by Contractor with Incentive and Penalty Payments	Formula for Payment Proposed by Contractor
Objective 1 Objective 2 Objective 3		

II. FINAL PAYMENT

Grade Level Increase Stipulated by Contractor on Standardized Test(s)	Fixed Price Proposal by Contractor with Incentives and Penalty Payments	Formula for Payment Proposed by Contractor

. General Conditions

Only those bidders which meet the following general conditions will be considered for selection:

A. The contractor shall accept the fixed time and the constraints imposed by the LEA and the performance requirement to maximize student learning as the general basis of ultimate contractor payment.

B. The contractor's instructional learning system must be tailored to the individual needs of the target population.

C. The contractor must be willing to utilize to the greatest extent possible the existing resources within the Texarkana and Liberty Eylau, U.S.A. participating schools.

D. The contractor must be willing to have all performance testing that is used as the basis of payment supervised by the project manager or his designee, employed by the LEA.

E. The contractor must agree to conduct his operational programs within the constraints of, and in accordance with, the intent and conditions of the evaluation design. (See Evaluation Design Attachment II).

F. The contractor must be willing to conduct program operations in the late afternoon or early evening at one or more sites for students. The additional cost for operating these evening centers shall not exceed the established costs for the operation of regular learning centers for similar students.

G. The instructional and/or learning systems to be utilized by the contractor must meet the following conditions:

1. The contractor shall guarantee that the operating costs of the proposed instructional system will decrease as a result of increased volume or through efficiencies when applied to a target population substantially larger than the size of the target population prescribed during the performance of this contract.

2. The contractor's instructional system utilized during the school year 1970-71 will be guaranteed to achieve a cost-effectiveness level of at least 50% of that demonstrated during the 1970-71 school year if the LEA adopts and incorporates it into grades 7-12 in the regular school system during the school year 1971-72. This guarantee applys only if the LEA utilizes the contractor's complete program.

3. The contractor must be willing to guarantee at least two alternative levels of cost effectiveness when the demonstrated instructional program is adopted into the regular school system conditioned upon the changes required by the LEA. The contractor must provide this information with attendant conditions within one month after receiving cost effectiveness data from the LEA concerning the instructional program of the participating school districts which will be available not later than April 15, 1971 nor earlier than February 15, 1971.

4. The contractor must be willing to negotiate an incentive contract with the LEA for an instructional system that could be utilized during the second and subsequent years of the project. The contractor must show that the instructional system is the most cost effective and below the school district's cost for student achievement at the same grade levels.

5. The contractor shall give consideration to the political and social problems within the community in the development and implementation of his program.

6. The contractor must make available data to the Project Manager or his designee to facilitate the analysis and implementation of the program in a prescribed format provided by the project manager.

7. To assist in implementing the demonstrated program into the participating school districts, the contractor shall train a minimum of ten mathematics and ten english teachers from the participating school

districts personnel to operate the learning center turnkey program for Phase III (1971-72). The LEA shall select the teachers to be trained. The contractor will provide cost information on the provided format.

8. The contractor must be willing to report the instructional system cost in a format prescribed by the project manager or his designee.

VI. Special Conditions

In his proposal, the contractor will indicate agreement to the following provisions and/or conditions or stipulate reasons to the contrary with supporting rationale and justification.

A. The following definitions shall apply in the program:

1. A student will be considered a dropout from the program if he or she leaves school or the program and does not reenter within 30 days. Exceptions to this definition are: (a) if a student graduates from high school, (b) if a student is drafted into military service, (c) if a student is physically or mentally incapacited (pregnancy excepted) to such an extent that he or she is not able to participate in the project and attend school as certified by a licensed physician, and (d) or other reasons mutually agreed on by the project manager and the contractor.

2. The starting time for each student will be the first day the students enters the program. Any exception to this procedure must be agreed upon by the project manager and the contractor, and any such agreement must be made in writing.

3. The target population for this project are students fulfilling the following entry criteria: (a) students in 1969-70 RLC program that did not gain one or more grade levels in reading comprehension or mathematics, (b) seventh grade students who are two or more grade levels deficient in reading and/or mathematics and who have an IQ of 75 or higher on the locally administered intelligence test, and (c) all students in grades 8-12 who are two or more grade levels deficient in reading and/or

mathematics and who have an IQ score of 75 or higher and who did not participate in 1969-70 RLC program. The State Education Department classifys students with an IQ below 75 as retarded. The contractor must be willing to accept the conditions and process by which the target population was selected. If any questions exists, it must be reconciled within fifteen days of the student's enrollment in the project according to a negotiation procedure agreed upon by the LEA and the contractor.

4. The ending time for the instructional program for each student shall be the date when the student took the standardized tests. If the student takes the January and May 1971 standardized tests, the latter date shall be considered the ending date.

5. Actual instructional time is the time between the starting time and the ending time minus the amount of time that student was absent from the instructional program.

B. The contractor shall establish a minimum of one learning center located at the following schools: College Hill Junior High School; Jefferson Avenue Junior High School; Arkansas Senior High School; Liberty Eylau Junior High School; and Liberty Eylau Senior High School.

C. Liability for attendance.

The LEA will be responsible for insuring that any student enrolled in school for that particular day will attend the specific component classes operated by the contractor. It will be the responsibility of the LEA to ensure that all students attend regular school classes and the learning center classes to the greatest extent possible. Specific after-school program operating hours will be established to allow students who have been absent to complete the work they have missed.

D. If the student leaves the project for cause, (defined in VI-A.1.), the contractor will receive cost reimbursement based upon a linear proration of costs up to the time of the students departure. The contractor fee-reimburse-

ment for the student's final performance and his or her performance on any interim performance objectives that have not been tested will be based upon a proration of the mean gain of the student's class, up to the time of the student's departure.

E. If the student leaves the program or school and is classified as a dropout, the contractor will receive no reimbursement. For every student who is a program dropout in excess of the five percent level, the contractor will be penalized an amount equal to the cost of one grade level increase in mathematics and reading. For every student retained in the program below the five percent level, the contractor will receive an incentive payment of an amount equal to the cost of one grade level increase for each student in mathematics and reading. The incentive or penalty will be calculated at the end of the year.

F. The learning center teacher will be required to submit a student attendance record daily and a program leaver report to the project director at the time a dropout occurs. The school leaver report will contain the names of each student that droppout of school and the reason for his dropping out.

G. The contractor shall agree to employ, wherever possible, local professional personnel and current school's employees to assist in the learning center program.

H. Where paraprofessionsls are used in the instructional program the contractor shall employ, wherever possible, personnel from the local community. Salaries and qualifications of such employees shall be commensurate with same in the local school districts.

I. The contractor and LEA must mutually agree to all employees used in the project.

J. The contractor shall be required to train and prepare all employees required to operate the instructional program in the learning centers.

K. The contractor shall be required to make maximun use of participating

school's facilities and equipment resources located at the school sites, i.e. mobile units, furnishings, desks, etc.

L. The contractor will be responsible for purchasing, assembly, installing, and maintaining all contractor owned equipment at his costs which will be utilized during the school year's operation. The contractor agrees to enter into future contracts with the LEA for the purchase of any equipment over which the contractor has pricing authority at the price quoted the LEA in the response with normal inflation esculator clauses. The LEA will have the option to exercise its rights under this contract at any time prior to June 30, 1971.

M. The contractor should specify his desires and/or intentions regarding the sale, publication, and copyrights to any or all materials and residuals that are the direct or indirect results of this contract.

N. Performance Bond

A bond in the amount of 50% of the contract amount shall be required of the successful contractor to guarantee performance of the contract, for the protection of employees and suppliers of equipment and materials, and to idemnify the LEA against loss or failure of the contractor to perform as agreed.

O. The contractor shall be required to purchase crime liability and property insurance to the extent that his interest may require.

P. The contractor should specify his agreement to fulfill the legal and social intent of all applicable non-discrimination statutes.

ATTACHMENT II

EVALUATION DESIGN

F. Evaluation Design Summary Chart

1. Learning Center Component

a. General Objectives

(1) To significantly reduce the percentage of dropouts in the Texarkana and Liberty Eylau School Districts

(2) To provide instruction with greater efficiency in mathematics and reading in grades 7-12

(3) To plan and implement a learning center program for potential dropouts in the Texarkana and Liberty Eylau School Districts.

EVALUATION DESIGN SUMMARY CHART

June 30, 1970

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
b. Learning Center Product Objectives						
(1) The achievement level in math and reading of 200 potential dropouts will be raised by two grade levels in 320 hours of instruction.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, SRA Achievement Tests, or other standardized tests	Standardized instruments already completed	Mathematics achievement, Reading achievement	200 students two or more grade levels deficient	Jan. 22, 1971 May 25, 1971	Project Director
(2) The dropout rate in grades 7-12 will be reduced to five percent.	School leaver report	Sept. 1, 1970	Names of students leaving school, reason for leaving school	All students in grades 7-12	End of each school month	Project Director
(3) The cost effectiveness of student achievement in mathematics and reading will increase by 75 percent.	Efficiency formula	Sept. 1, 1970	Instructional time, instructional cost, student achievement	Learning Center students, all students in grades 7-12	July 15, 1971	Project Director
(4) Learning Center programs will be operating in a minimum of five secondary schools	Record form	July 1, 1970	Name of center Names of teachers Names of aides Names of students Date of starting Grade level	All secondary schools	Sept. 15, 1970	Project Director

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	Evaluator's Report Date	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION Dissemination of Evaluation Results of Overall Project Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Product Objective No:					
(1a) Analysis within group to determine if significant gain has been made between pre and post tests.	Feb. 20, 1971	Project Director	Written report	March 5, 1971	Various educational and professional groups
(1b) Comparison of gains made by Learning Center students and a comparison group not receiving Learning Center instruction	July 1, 1971			July 15, 1971	Director of Instruction
(2) Tabulation of numbers and reasons; calculate percentages	End of each month	Project Director	Written report	5th of each month	School staff within system and other interested professional persons
(3) Apply formula to Learning Center students and students in general	Aug. 1, 1971	Project Director	Written report, professional journals	Aug. 15, 1971	Various educational and professional groups, Director of Instruction
(4) Tabulation of report forms	Oct. 1, 1970	Project Director	Written report	Oct. 5, 1970	Evaluator, Resident Director, School Administrator in each participating school, Director of Instruction

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
b. Learning Center Product Objectives (continued)						
(5) Twenty-two teachers in English and mathematics will be trained to operate Learning Center programs.	Program description of each training session, Evaluation instrument to measure training objectives	5 days prior to training session	Date of training session, Names of participants, Descriptions of training program, Evaluation design	22 secondary teachers in participating school districts	End of each training session	Project Director
(6) A public information system will be established which involves multi-level groups and uses multi-media approaches in providing information to those groups.	Contact Report Dissemination record	July 1, 1970 July 1, 1970	Frequency and kinds of contacts with groups; Recipient or audience, time of activity, kind of activity	Program management staff, Staffs of school systems, school boards, students, parents, professional groups, universities, Civic groups, State Dept. of Education	End of each month	Project Director

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	Evaluator's Report Date	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
(5) Analysis of program results of training sessions	June 15, 1971	Project Director	Written Report	July 1, 1971	Superintendent of Schools, Secondary Principals, participants, U. S. Office of Education, Director of Instruction
(6) Tabulation of contacts and dissemination activities	15th of each month	Project Director	Written Report	Quarterly	Superintendent of Schools, U. S. Office of Education, Interested professional groups, Director of Instruction

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
c. LC Process Objectives						
(1) To identify all the target population eligible to participate in the LC Program as defined by the following entry criteria:	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, SRA Achievement Tests, Lorge Thorndike	Standardized instruments already completed	Intelligence, mathematics achievement, reading achievement, target population list including names of students by school, sex, age, grade, and race meeting entry criteria	All students in grades 7-12	Aug. 1, 1970	Project Director
(a) Students in 1969-70 RLC program who did not gain one or more grade levels in reading comprehension or mathematics;						
(b) New seventh-grade students who are two or more grade levels deficient in reading and mathematics and who have an IQ score of 75 or higher on an intelligence test;						
(c) All students in grades 8-12 who are two or more grade levels deficient in reading and mathematics and who have an IQ score of 75 or higher and who did not participate in 1969-70 RLC program.						
(2) To select a minimum of 200 students from the target population to be enrolled in the Learning Center Program.	Random Table	Already available	Random Selection	All students in target population	Sept. 1, 1970	Project Director and Evaluator

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	Evaluator's Report Date	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Process Objective No: (1) Identify all meeting entry criteria	Aug. 15, 1970	Project Director	Printed List	Sept. 1, 1970	Evaluator, Component Manager, Director of Instruction
(2) Tabulation of number selected and compare with minimum criteria	Sept. 1, 1970	Project Director	Printed List	Sept. 1, 1970	Secondary Principals, Teachers, Component Manager, Director of Instruction

1096

Evaluation Design Summary Chart (continued)

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type Of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
c. Process Objectives (cont.)						
(3) To choose a contractor with the highest RFP rating to provide the learning center instructional program.	Point System	July 15, 1970	Criteria in RFP Establish priority of criteria Assign points to criteria	All contractors who bid on project	Aug. 1, 1970	Supt. of Schools, School Board, Project Director, Management Support
(4) To schedule students for learning center program for a minimum of 45 minutes per day per subject.	Conflict Matrix	July 15, 1970	Student schedule which includes: name of student, time to attend learning center, frequency of attendance, classroom assignment	All students selected for learning center program	Aug. 15, 1970 Jan. 15, 1971	Project Director Secondary Principals
(5) To employ a minimum of five teachers and five aides from applications rated highest by Project Director and Superintendent of Schools	Application Blanks	Already Completed	College training, experience, personal data	All applicants for positions, preference for people from target population	Aug. 15, 1970	Supt. of Schools, Component Manager, Project Director

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
		Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
	Evaluator's Report Date	Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Process Objective No.:					
(3) Tabulation of points for each contractor bid.	Aug. 15, 1970	Superintendent of Schools	Printed and Oral Announcement	Aug. 15, 1970	To all contractors, U.S. Office of Education, School Personnel, State Dept. of Education
(4) Place student's schedule on a space utilization chart and eliminate conflicts.	Sept. 1, 1970 Feb. 1, 1971	Project Director	Printed List	Sept. 1, 1970 Feb. 1, 1971	Secondary Principals, Teachers, Component Manager, Director of Instruction
(5) Observation and judgment by raters.	Aug. 20, 1970	Project Director	Letter	Aug. 20, 1970	Secondary Principals, Director of Instruction

Evaluation Design Summary Chart (continued)

June 30, 1970

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
c. Process Objectives (cont.)						
(6) To conduct in-service training for a minimum of five teachers and five aides where the training objectives are achieved.	Instruments designed to measure objectives	Aug. 15, 1970	Description of variables, objectives of training program, evaluation design	Learning Center teachers and aides	Aug. 31, 1970	Component Manager, Project Director, Evaluator
(7) To establish two exit testing dates where student achievement can be assessed under the same conditions that were used in the enrollment selection.	Schedule, test condition record	Jan. 1, 1971 May 1, 1971	Time of testing, place of test, test administrator, names of students taking tests	All students in Learning Center group	Jan. 22, 1971 May 25, 1971	Project Director, Component Manager
(8) To exit students from the Learning Center program into the Turnkey Program when students' exit test scores are at their appropriate level.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, SRA Achievement Tests	Standardized instruments already completed	Mathematics achievement, reading achievement, length of time in program	All Learning Center students	Feb. 5, 1971 May 30, 1971	Project Director
(9) To develop a list of tasks needed to initiate and operate the LC program and to establish a time schedule for performing those tasks. This list is to be completed by August 1, 1970.	Written task list; Calendar of Events	Aug. 1, 1970	Implementation tasks, operational tasks, time schedule	N/A	Aug. 1, 1970	Management Support

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	Evaluator's Report Date	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
(6) Compare gathered information against objectives.	Sept. 15, 1970	Project Director	Written Report	October 1, 1970	Resident Director, Supt. of Schools, Participants, Secondary Principals, Director of Instruction
(7) Compare conditions of exit testing against test conditions when target population was identified.	July 1, 1971	Project Director	In final report	June 30, 1971	U.S. Office Of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Other interested Professional groups, Director of Instruction
(8) Check achievement test scores of each student on exit tests against entry test scores.	Feb. 15, 1971 June 15, 1971	Project Director	Written report	Feb. 17, 1971 June 17, 1971	Teacher, Secondary Principal, Director of Instruction
(9) Preparation and observation of written tasks with a calendar of events.	August 1, 1970	Project Director	Written report	Aug. 15, 1970	Staff Management group, Supt. of Schools, Evaluator, Component Manager

Evaluation Design Summary Chart (continued)

June 30, 1970

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
c. Process Objectives (cont.)						
(10) To utilize equipment in learning centers with not more than 10 percent "down" time.	Maintenance report	Sept. 1, 1970	Time the equipment is not in operating condition; causes of breakdown	Equipment in Learning Centers	End of each month	Component Manager
(11) To utilize efficient instructional techniques and materials to meet individual student needs as indicated by 75 percent of the students enrolled showing at least 1.0 grade level increase in mathematics and reading in one semester.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, SRA Achievement Tests, Materials utilization record, Rewards record	Already completed Already completed Sept. 1, 1970 Sept. 1, 1970	Mathematics Achievement; Reading Achievement; Amount of time various instructional materials are used; kinds, frequency, and amounts of rewards.	Learning Center students	End of each month	Component Manager
(12) To require contractor to provide performance bond for insuring that instructional materials do not include exact exit test items.	Bond	At time contract is signed	Statement on responsibility of keeping instructional material free from test material	Contractor	At time contract is signed	Supt. of Schools
(13) To develop a performance budgeting system that will provide a cost efficiency ratio.	Modified PPBS	Sept. 30, 1970	Instructional time, instructional cost by program, student achievement	Participating school districts	July 15, 1971	Management Support

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	Evaluator's Report Date	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
(10) Analysis of maintenance reports	5th of each month	Project Director	Written report	10th of each month	Staff management group, Director of Instruction, Secondary Principals
(11) Correlations between: achievement and rewards, achievement and utilization time of instructional materials, achievement gains and rewards, achievement gains and utilization time of instructional materials.	Feb. 15, 1971 July 1, 1971	Project Director	Written reports, final reports, journal articles	March 15, 1971 July 15, 1971	All interested educational and professional groups
(12) Analyzed by school lawyer.	Sept. 1, 1970	Superintendent of Schools	Written record	When requested	Other contractors, interested educational groups
(13) Judgment by outside cost analysis expert.	Aug. 1, 1971	Project Director	Written report	Aug. 15, 1971	School administrators, Component Manager

Evaluation Design Summary Chart (continued)

June 30, 1970

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS: Name/Type of Instrument	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS: Date Instrument to be Completed	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS: Baseline Data	DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES: Target Group	DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES: Scheduled Date(s)	DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES: Person Responsible
c. Process Objectives (cont.)						
(14) To develop a written program description of a public information system.	Program information form	Sept. 30, 1970	Objectives, desired target audience, methods, what to disseminate	Various audiences	Sept. 30, 1970	Project Director
(15) To involve effectively a minimum of six groups in the planning and operation of the program as indicated by a record of contacts and by the positive results on a feedback questionnaire.	Contact record, Feedback questionnaire	Sept. 1, 1970 Aug. 1, 1970	Number of contacts, who initiated contacts, time involved in contacts, number involved in contacts, amount of involvement, attitude toward involvement	Various educational and community groups	As group meetings are scheduled	Project Director
(16) To develop and operate a student information system that provides data on number of dropouts, school absences, grade retention, and subject failures, and related information.	School leaver report, attendance record, grade reports	Sept. 1, 1970 Already developed, Already developed	Names of students who leave school, school attendance, number of times a student is retained, number and kinds of subjects that a student fails	All students in grades 4-6	Feb. 1, 1971 June 1, 1971	Project Director

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	Evaluator's Report Date	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
(14) Review by dissemination specialist.	Oct. 15, 1970	Project Director	Written report	Nov. 1, 1970	Interested educational groups, Project management staff
(15) Tabulate and analyze contact records and responses from feedback questionnaires.	15 days after group meeting	Project Director	Written report, newspaper articles	After group meetings	U.S. Office of Education, Supt. of Schools, General Public
(16) Tabluate and summarize data gathered from instruments.	July 1, 1971	Project Director	Written reports, newspaper articles, journal articles	July 15, 1971	Attendance Officer, Entire School Staff, Resident Director, Interested educational and professional groups, general public

June 30, 1970

2. Turnkey Component

a. General Objectives

(1) To significantly reduce the percentage of dropouts in Texarkana and Liberty Eylau School Districts.

(2) To provide instruction with greater efficienty in mathematics and reading in grades 7-12.

(3) To plan and implement effective Learning Center techniques in the regular instructional program in the Texarkana and Liberty Eylau School Districts.

EVALUATION DESIGN SUMMARY CHART

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
b. Turnkey Product Objectives						
(1) The achievement level in mathematics and reading of at least 200 potential dropouts in grades 7-12 will be raised two grade levels in 320 hours of instruction.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, SRA Achievement Tests	Standardized instruments already completed	Mathematics achievement, Reading achievement	200 students two or more grade levels deficient	Jan. 22, 1971 May 25, 1971	Project Director
(2) The dropout rate in grades 7-12 will be reduced to five percent.	School leaver report	Sept. 1, 1970	Names of students leaving school, reason for leaving school	All students in grades 7-12	End of each school month	Project Director
(3) The cost effectiveness of student achievement in mathematics and reading will increase by 50 percent.	Efficiency formula	Sept, 1, 1970	Instructional time, instructional cost, student achievement	Turnkey students, all students in grades 7-12	July 15, 1971	Project Director
(4) Turnkey programs will be operating in a minimum of ten English and ten mathematics classes in grades 7-12.	Record forms	July 1, 1970	Name of school Name of teacher Name of supervisor Names of students Date of starting Grade level	All secondary English and mathematics classes	Sept. 15, 1970	Project Director

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
	Evaluator's Report Date	Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
		Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Product Objective No.:					
(1a) Analysis within group to determine if significant gain has been made between pre- and post-tests.	Feb. 20, 1971	Project Director	Written report	March 5, 1971	Various educational and professional groups
(1b) Comparison of gains made by Learning Center students and a comparison group not receiving Learning Center instruction.	July 1, 1971			July 15, 1971	Director of Instruction
(2) Tabulation of numbers and reasons and calculate percentages.	End of each month	Project Director	Written report	5th of each month	School staff within system and other interested professional persons
(3) Apply formula to Learning Center students and students in general	Aug. 1, 1971	Project Director	Written report, professional journals	Aug. 15, 1971	Various educational and professional groups, Director of Instruction
(4) Tabulation of report forms	Oct. 1, 1970	Project Director	Written report	Oct. 5, 1970	Evaluator, Resident Director, School administrator in each participating school, Director of Instruction

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
b. Turnkey Product Objectives: (continued)						
(5) Eighty-six English and mathematics teachers will be trained to operate Turnkey programs in Phase III.	Program description of each training session; Evaluation instrument to measure training objectives	5 days prior to training session	Date of training session, names of participants, description of training program, evaluation design	86 math and English teachers in participating school districts	End of each training session	Project Director, Component Manager
(6) A public information system will be established which involves multi-level groups and uses multi-media approaches in providing information to those groups.	Contact report Dissemination record	July 1, 1970 July 1, 1970	Frequency and kinds of contacts with groups; Recipient or audience, time of activity, kind of activity	Program management staff, Staffs of school systems, school boards, Students, Parents, Professional groups, Universities, Civic groups, State Dept. of Education	End of each training session	Project Director

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
	Evaluator's Report Date	Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
		Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
(5) Analysis of program results of training sessions.	June 15, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 1, 1971	Superintendent of Schools, Junior High Principals, Participants, U.S. Office of Education, Director of Instruction
(6) Tabulation of contacts and dissemination activities.	15th of each month	Project Director	Written report	Quarterly	Superintendent of Schools, Junior High Principals, U. S. Office of Education, Director of Instruction

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
c. Turnkey Process Objectives						
(1) To identify all the target population eligible to participate in the Turnkey program as defined by the following criteria: (a) Students in 1969-70 Rapid Learning Center program who gained one or more grade levels in reading comprehension or mathematics, and (b) students outside the target population scheduled in the same classes as successful 1969-70 RLC students.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, SRA Achievement Tests, Lorge Thorndike	Standardized instruments already completed	Intelligence, mathematics achievement, reading achievement, target population list including names of students by school, sex, age, grade, and race meeting entry criteria	All students in grades 7-12	Aug. 1, 1970	Project Director
(2) To select from the target population a minimum of 250 students in mathematics and 250 students in reading to be enrolled in the Turnkey classes.	Random table	Already available	Random selection	All students in target population	Sept. 1, 1970	Project Director and Evaluator
(3) To schedule students for the Turnkey program for a minimum of one class period per day per subject.	Conflict Matrix	July 15, 1970	Student schedule which includes: name of student, time to attend Turnkey, frequency of attendance, classroom assignment	All students selected for Turnkey Program	Aug. 15, 1970 Jan. 15, 1971	Project Director, Secondary Principals

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
	Evaluator's Report Date	Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
		Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Process Objective No.: (1) Identify all meeting entry criteria	Aug. 15, 1970	Project Director	Printed List	Sept. 1, 1970	Evaluator, Resident Director, Director of Instruction
(2) Tabulation of number selected and compare with minimum criteria.	Sept. 1, 1970	Project Director	Printed List	Sept. 1, 1970	Junior High School Principals, Teachers, Resident Director, Director of Instruction
(3) Place student's schedule on a space utilization chart and eliminate conflicts.	Sept. 1, 1970 Feb. 1, 1971	Project Director	Printed List	Sept. 1, 1970 Feb. 1, 1971	Secondary School Principals, Teachers, Component Manager, Director of Instruction

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
c. Turnkey Process Objectives (continued)						
(4) To select twenty-two teachers and four aides to operate Turnkey classes in grades 7-12.	Application blanks	Already completed	College training, experience, personal data	All applicants for positions, Preference for people from target population	Aug. 15, 1970	Supt. of Schools, Component Manager, Project Director
(5) To conduct in-service training for Turnkey teachers and aides.	Instruments designed to measure objectives	Aug. 15, 1970	Description of variables, objectives of training program, evaluation design	Turnkey teachers and aides	Aug. 31, 1970	Evaluator, Component Manager, Project Director
(6) To establish two exit testing dates where Turnkey student achievement can be assessed under the same conditions that were used in the enrollment selection.	Schedule, test condition, record	Jan. 1, 1971 May 1, 1971	Time of testing, place of test, test administrator; names of students taking tests	All students in Turnkey program	Jan. 22, 1971 May 25, 1971	Project Director, Component Manager

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
		Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
	Evaluator's Report Date	Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
(4) Observation and judgment by raters.	Aug. 20, 1970	Project Director	Letter	Aug. 20, 1970	Secondary School Principals, Director of Instruction
(5) Compare gathered information against objectives.	Sept. 15, 1970	Project Director	Written report	Oct. 1, 1970	Component Manager, Superintendent of Schools, Participants, Secondary Principals, Director of Instruction
(6) Compare conditions of exit testing against test conditions when target population was identified.	July 1, 1971	Project Director	In final report	June 30, 1971	U.S. Office of Education, Superintendent of Schools, Other interested Professional Groups, Director of Instruction

Evaluation Design Summary Chart (Continued) June 30, 1970

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
(7) To develop a list of tasks needed to initiate and operate the Turnkey program and to establish a time schedule for performing those tasks. This list is to be completed by August 1, 1970.	Written task list; Calendar of Events	Aug. 1, 1970	Implementation tasks, operational tasks, time schedule	N/A	Aug. 1, 1970	Management Support
(8) To utilize equipment in Turnkey program with not more than 10% "down" time.	Maintenance report	Sept. 1, 1970	Time the equipment is not in operating condition; causes of breakdown	Equipment in Turnkey rooms	End of each month	Component Manager
(9) To utilize efficient instrucional techniques and materials to meet individual student needs as indicated by 75 percent of the students enrolled showing at least 1.0 grade level increase in mathematics and reading in one semester.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, SRA Achievement Tests, Materials utilization record, Rewards Record	Already completed Already completed Sept. 1, 1970 Sept. 1, 1970	Mathematics achievement, reading achievement; amount of time various instructional materials are used; kinds, frequency, and amounts of rewards	Turnkey students	End of each month	Turnkey teacher and Component Manager

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
	Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project				
	Evaluator's Report Date	Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
(7) Preparation and observation of written tasks with a calendar of events.	Aug. 1, 1970	Project Director	Written report	Aug. 15, 1970	Staff management group, Superintendent of Schools, Evaluator, Component Manager
(8) Analysis of maintenance reports.	5th of each month	Project Director	Written report	10th of each month	Staff management group, Director of Instruction, Secondary Principals
(9) Correlations between: achievement and rewards, achievement and utilization time of instructional materials, achievement gains and rewards, achievement gains and utilization time of instructional materials,	Feb. 15, 1971 July 1, 1971	Project Director	Written reports, final reports, journal articles	March 15, 1971 July 15, 1971	All interested educational and professional groups

Evaluation Design Summary Chart (continued)

June 30, 1970

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
(10) To develop a performance budgeting system that will provide a cost efficiency ratio.	Modified PPBS	Sept. 30, 1970	Instructional time, instructional cost by program, student achievement	Participating school districts	July 15, 1971	Management Support
(11) To develop a written program description of a public information system.	Program information form	Sept. 30, 1970	Objectives, desired target audience, methods, what to disseminate	Various audiences	Sept. 30, 1970	Project Director
(12) To involve effectively a minimum of six groups in the planning and operation of the program as indicated by a record of contacts and by the positive results of a feedback questionnaire.	Contact record, Feedback Questionnaire	Sept. 1, 1970 Aug. 1, 1970	Number of contacts, who initiated contacts, time involved in contacts, number involved in contacts, amount of involvement, attitude toward involvement	Various educational and community groups	As group meetings are scheduled	Project Director
(13) To develop and operate a student information system that provides data on number of dropouts, school absences, grade retention, and subject failures.	School leaver report, attendance record, grade reports	Sept. 1, 1970 already developed, already developed	Names of students who leave school, school attendance, number of times a student is retained, number and kinds of subjects that a student fails.	All students in grades 7-12	Feb. 1, 1971 June 1, 1971	Project Director

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
	Evaluator's Report Date	Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
		Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
(10) Judgment by outside cost analysis expert.	August 1, 1971	Project Director	Written report	August 15, 1971	School Administrators Component Manager
(11) Review by dissemination specialists.	October 15, 1970	Project Director	Written report	November 1, 1970	Interested educational groups, Project management staff
(12) Tabulate and analyze contact records and responses from feedback questionnaires.	15 days after group meeting	Project Director	Written report; newspaper articles	After group meetings	U.S. Office of Education, Superintendent of Schools, General public
(13) Tabulate and summarize data gathered from instruments.	July 1, 1971	Project Director	Written reports, newspaper articles, journal articles	July 15, 1971	Attendance officer, entire school staff, Component Manager, interested educational and professional groups, general public

June 30, 1970

3. Curriculum and Instructional Component

a. General Objectives

(1) To involve the teaching, administrative, supervisory staff, and citizens in the development, improvement, and coordination of the English, mathematics, and vocational education curricula of the secondary schools of the districts.

(2) To assist secondary teachers in English, mathematics, and vocational education in developing effective approaches, techniques, and content in such areas as planning with children, individualized instruction, grouping, testing and evaluation, and understanding and guiding the learning activities of the potential dropout.

EVALUATION DESIGN SUMMARY CHART

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
b. Curriculum and Instructional Product Objectives						
(1) Mathematics and English teachers will demonstrate knowledge of contingency management techniques as indicated by evaluation results of training sessions.	Feedback questionnaire based upon training objectives	Before each training session	Description of variables; objectives of training	86 Secondary teachers of English and mathematics	At completion of each training session	Evaluator, Component Manager
(2) Mathematics and English teachers will demonstrate knowledge of individualized instructional techniques as indicated by evaluation results of training sessions.	Feedback questionnaire based upon training objectives	Before each training session	Description of variables; objectives of training	86 Secondary teachers	At completion of each training session	Evaluator, Component Manager
(3) Mathematics, English, and Vocational Education teachers will demonstrate application skills in writing behavioral objectives as indicated by written objectives for their curriculum areas.	Program objectives in mathematics, English, and Vocational Education	June 1, 1971	Course requirements, content, and outcomes	86 Secondary teachers	Throughout school year, 1970-71	Component Manager

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
		Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
	Evaluator's Report Date	Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
(1) Compare feedback questionnaire with training objectives.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School Administrators, Participants, Project Personnel
(2) Compare feedback questionnaire with training objectives.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School Administrators and Participants; Project Personnel
(3) Compare written objectives to course content and criteria for writing program objectives in the publication, PREPARING and WRITING BEHAVIOR OBJECTIVES.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School Administrators, Project Personnel

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
(4) School personnel will demonstrate knowledge of needed vocational experiences for the potential dropout as indicated by a written planned vocational education program.	Vocational Education Curriculum Guide	June 1, 1971	Outline for each course in vocational education	Vocational Education Teachers	Throughout School Year, 1970-71	Component Manager
(5) School personnel will demonstrate comprehension of the individual needs of students as indicated by the development of a grading system that recognizes individual abilities.	Grading System	June 1, 1971	Basis for grading	All school personnel	School Year, 1970-71	Component Manager

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
	Evaluator's Report Date	Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
		Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
(4) Compare Curriculum Guide with goals of Vocational Education.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School Administrators; news media; school personnel; business and industrial leaders
(5) Compare grading system with goals of individualized instruction.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School Administrators; news media; school personnel; students

Evaluation Design Summary Chart (continued)

June 30, 1970

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
c. Process Objectives: Curriculum Component						
(1) To conduct in-service training for mathematics and English teachers and aides in contingency management, individualized instructional techniques, and writing behavioral objectives.	Program description and feedback questionnaires	Three days before each scheduled in-service training session	Content and objectives of training sessions	English and mathematics teachers	Throughout school year, 1970-71	Component Manager
(2) To develop a list of tasks needed to initiate curriculum revisions in the school districts and establish a time schedule for performing those tasks.	Task analysis and calendar of events	Oct. 1, 1970	Task requirements; time requirements.	Committee members assigned	Throughout school year, 1970-71	Management Support

I24a

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
	Evaluator's Report Date	Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
		Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Process Objective No:					
(1) Compare feedback with training objectives	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School Administrators; participants; Project Personnel
(2) Compare completed calendar of events with planned calendar of events.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School Administrators; Project Personnel

Evaluation Design Summary Chart (continued)

June 30, 1970

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
Process Objectives: Curriculum (continued)						
(3) To organize committees and utilize consultants to study needed Vocational Education Programs.	Minutes of Committee Meetings	June 1, 1971	Agenda items and activities to be covered in meeting	Representatives of school personnel and various community groups	Throughout School Year, 1970-71	Component Manager
(4) To organize a committee of teachers, administrators, parents, and students to develop a grading system appropriate to a self-pacing instructional system.	Minutes of Committee Meetings	June 1, 1971	Agenda items and activities to be covered in meeting	Committee members	Throughout School Year, 1970-71	Component Manager

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
		Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
	Evaluator's Report Date	Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Process Objective No:					
(3) Audit of agenda and minutes.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School Administrators; Committee Members; Project Personnel
(4) Audit of agenda and minutes.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School Administrators; Committee Members; Project Personnel

June 30, 1970

4. Counseling and Guidance Component

a. General Objectives

(1) To help the potential dropout to increase his self-esteem.

(2) To assist the potential dropout to raise his level of aspiration.

EVALUATION DESIGN SUMMARY CHART

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
b. Product Objectives:						
(1) The student will increase his self-esteem as measured by significant improvement in pre- and post-test scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.	Tennessee Self Concept Scale	Standardized, already completed	Self-esteem . Identity . Self-acceptance . Perception of own behavior	Learning Center students	Sept., 1970 May, 1971	Evaluator; Component Manager
(2) The student will demonstrate increased self-esteem by decreasing the gap between his self-assessment and standardized assessment as measured by pre- and post-test scores on the Lorge-Thorndike.	Self-Inventory and Lorge-Thorndike	Sept. 1, 1970 Standardized	1. Assessment of ability by self 2. Assessment of ability by a standardized test.	Learning Center students	Sept., 1970 and May, 1971	Evaluator; Component Manager
(3) The student will demonstrate increased self-esteem by adjusting to changing classroom condions as measured by pre- and post-test scores on a behavior checklist completed by teachers.	Behavior Checklist	Already completed	Behavior related to: 1. Self 2. Group 3. School	Learning Center students	Sept., 1970 and May, 1971	Evaluator; Component Manager

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
		Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
	Evaluator's Report Date	Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Product Objective No:					
(1) Test for significance of differences in pre-and post-test scores on Tennessee Self Concept Scale.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	Various educational and professional groups
(2) Comparison of pre-test self-assessment and Lorge-Thorndike with post-tests.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	Various educational and professional groups
(3) Comparison of pre-and post-test scores.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	Various educational and professional groups

Evaluation Design Summary Chart (continued)

June 30, 1970

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
Product Objectives: (continued)						
(4) The student will aspire to higher vocational goals at the end of the year than at the beginning, as measured by the supplement to the Dictionary of Occupational Titles.	Student questionnaire	Aug. 30, 1970	Students' interests, Students' educational goals, Students' occupational goals	Learning Center students	Sept., 1970 May, 1971	Evaluator
(5) The student will set a realistic vocational goal as indicated through a comparison of his chosen goal with scores on the GATB.	1. Student questionnaire 2. GATB	1. Aug. 30, 1970 2. Already standardized	1. Vocational goal 2. Measure of aptitude	Random sample of Learning Center students	March, 1971	Evaluator

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
		Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
	Evaluator's Report Date	Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Product Objective No.: (4) Comparison of pre-and post-questionnaire with the supplement of the Dictionary of Occupation Titles.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; all project personnel and school personnel
(5) Comparison of expressed vocational goal and GATB results.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; all project personnel and school personnel

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
c. Process Objectives						
(1) To develop an eighth-grade career development course.	Course syllabus	June 1, 1971	Course content; objectives	Vocational Education teachers and counselors	Throughout school year, 1970-71	Component Manager
(2) To conduct training sessions with the parents of potential dropouts to assist in implementing effective child-rearing procedures.	Record of parent training sessions	June 1, 1971	Agenda items to be covered in parent sessions	Parents of Learning Center students	Throughout school year, 1970-71	Component Manager
(3) To develop a handbook of available services to assist the potential dropout.	Survey form	June 1, 1971	List of referral sources for available services	Learning Center students and their parents	Throughout school year, 1970-71	Component Manager
(4) To develop a referral system so that special needs of potential dropouts might be fulfilled.	Flow-Chart	June 1, 1971	Services available; how contacts are made; reporting system	Learning Center students	Throughout school year, 1970-71	Component Manager

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
	Evaluator's Report Date	Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
		Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Process Objective No.:					
(1) Compare the course syllabus with goals of Vocational Education	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; Project personnel
(2) Audit of agenda and records of parent training sessions.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; parents participating; Project personnel
(3) Spot check reliability of information by telephoning a number of agencies listed.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; Project personnel; parents of Learning Center Students
(4) Identify discrepancies in plans and actual practices.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; Project personnel

Evaluation Design Summary Chart (continued)

June 30, 1970

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
Process Objectives: (continued)						
(5) To develop needed counseling services for potential dropouts and coordinate the existing counseling services with the Dropout Prevention Program.	Program Description	Oct. 15, 1970	-description of variables -basic services -objectives -calendar of events	Learning Center students; Turnkey students	September and October, 1970	Component Manager
(6) To establish social modeling programs for potential dropouts, using peer models.	Description of planned program	Nov. 1, 1970	-variables -objectives -calendar of events	Learning Center and Turnkey students	October, 1970	Component Manager
(7) To plan special services needed by potential dropouts and coordinate the Dropout Prevention Program with the services of other community groups and agencies.	Plans for program	Nov. 15, 1970	-description of needed services -available services -plans for coordination of services	Learning Center and Turnkey students	November, 1970	Component Manager

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
	Evaluator's Report Date	Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
		Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Process Objective No.: (5) Evaluate program description by using the publication: "Critiquing a Proposal".	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; Project personnel; school personnel
(6) Compare planned program to criteria in "Critiquing a Proposal".	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; Project personnel; school personnel
(7) Compare plans to criteria in "Critiquing a Proposal".	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; Project personnel; school personnel; parents; students; community leaders

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS			DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES		
	Name/Type of Instrument	Date Instrument to be Completed	Baseline Data	Target Group	Scheduled Date(s)	Person Responsible
Process Objectives:(continued)						
(8) To train counselors in behavioral counseling techniques.	Description of planned program and feedback	Nov. 1, 1970	Contents and objectives of training sessions	Project counselors; School counselors	Throughout the school year, 1970-71	Component Manager
(9) To develop a pupil personnel record system for potential dropouts that will be correlated with the school district's pupil personnel records.	Program description	Nov. 15, 1970	-description of needed records -data collection procedures -maintenance system -dissemination of pupil records -plans for coordination	Project counselors; school counselors	Throughout school year, 1970-71	Component Manager

DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	DATA ANALYSIS PRESENTATION				
		Dissemination of Evaluation Results for Overall Project			
	Evaluator's Report Date	Person Responsible	Method	Schedule	Recipient/ Audience
For Process Objective No.:					
(8) Compare feedback with training objectives.	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; Participants; Project personnel
(9) Compare program description to criteria listed in "Critiquing a Proposal".	June 30, 1971	Project Director	Written report	July 15, 1971	School administrators; Project personnel; School personnel

ATTACHMENT III

PROPOSAL AND BUDGET FORMAT

PART A: PROPOSAL FORMAT

PART B: PRICING ARRANGEMENT AND BUDGET PRESENTATION

PART A. SUBSTANTIVE PROPOSAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Statement of the Problem

II. Technical Approach

III. Project Organization and Management

IV. Project Manning Specifications

V. Corporate Background (incl. personnel data)

VI. Appendix (incl. hardware specifications)

PART B. COST PROPOSAL

I. Cost Data and Pricing Arrangements

PART A. SUBSTANTIVE PROPOSAL

SPECIFICATIONS: For Proposal Submission (by sections). The total proposal will not be permanently bound. Each section of the proposal will be bound together.

I. Statement of the Problem

The bidder should open discussion with a "statement of the problem" section outlining the bidder's understanding of the project being considered and conceptual approach planned by the Texarkana and Liberty Eylau school districts. This "statement of the problem" should include the following:

A. An understanding of the norms, procedures and current status of the Texarkana and Liberty Eylau School Systems, and associated interest groups and elements, as related to the contractor operated instructional programs.

B. Relevant history of similar programs with parallels, if any, being illustrated.

C. Ways in which the bidders proposal meets and satisfies the general conditions specified in the RFP.

D. Brief overview of the proposed approach as presented with appropriate and concise comment on any unique elements of the proposed system.

E. The rationale behind any proposed consortium effort.

The foregoing should serve to represent in capsule form the proposal that will follow. No mention should be made within this section of cost.

II. Technical Approach Data Management System (people, format, times of collection and reports)

A. The bidder should present a technical approach with an order of presentation closely paralleling the organization, management, and method of operation that would be utilized.

B. Detailed technical data, charts, and tables found necessary to support the technical approach should be relegated to a technical appendix, with appropriate annotation directing the reader from a relevant passage to said appendix.

Technical data found essential to the basic understanding of the technical approach may remain within the approach but should be immediately visible to, and in the exact vicinity of, the relevant narrative.

C. Cost data should not be included within the technical approach. Alternative technical functions which cause or reflect changes in cost data should receive distinctive annotation that provides for a matching of support cost data and attendant technical data.

D. Although a separate manning section should be provided, manpower change points within the technical approach should receive some form of annotation. Such annotation should refer to appropriate detailed data within the manning document.

E. A "total system" is called for in the establishment of the proposed program. Should a bidder feel that the total system contains various alternative elements, the primary approach and alternative elements should be presented in such a manner as to prevent confusion and indicate the bidder's position concerning the total system and alternative elements. Complete rationale for such alternative elements should be provided.

III. Project Organization and Management

The bidder should provide complete details concerning the proposed project organization and management. This is to include appropriate charts, such as functional flow diagrams or PERT diagrams. Specific mention should made of the following:

A. Contractor-school system information exchange procedures

B. Contractor evaluation and quality control programs

C. If sub-contracts are considered for portions of the project, complete data regarding the use and management relationships between such sub-contractor(s) and the prime bidder should be provided.

IV. Project Manning Specifications

A. Bidders should present data indicating levels and time phasing of manpower projected system.

B. Where alternatives are proposed within the technical proposal, appropriate indications should be made within the manning projections that reflect selection of the alternatives.

V. Corporate Background

A. The bidder should provide data which is representative of previous work experience and include appropriate references.

B. Resumes of key operational and managerial personnel should be provided. Should the use of consultant personnel be anticipated, resumes and signed letter of availability should be provided. In addition, any such consultants should demonstrate within the letter of availability, or other such document, that a general knowledge of the Texarkana-Liberty Eylau program is held.

C. Separate division by notation should be made for any data concerning subcontractors.

VI. Appendix

A. Data considered by the bidder to be a necessary element to support the proposal should be provided in the appendix.

B. Hardware data and detailed specifications, if any, should be found in the appendix.

C. Any other information considered necessary for inclusion in the proposal, but not considered appropriate in sections I through V, may be included in appropriately described appendices.

PART B. PRICING ARRANGEMENT AND BUDGET PRESENTATION

I. Pricing Arrangement.

The bidder should present his pricing arrangement in a clear, concise format reflecting the method of contractor payment described in Attachment I.

The bidder's pricing arrangement should be presented in a format similar to that described in Method of Cost Payment, Attachment I, indicating the maximum guarantee of unit of student achievement, giving time and cost constraints.

II. Estimated Budget

The bidder will be required to present a detailed cost breakdown. Since cost relationships are a primary concern in determining optimal cost effectiveness learning system configurations for "turnkey" decisions, the prime contractor is requested to present budget estimates in this proposal in the following format:

	Start-up		Operational	Development	
Administrative	Non-Reoccur	Reoccur*		Unique**	non-unique
Salaries					
Equipment (depreciation)					
Materials & Supplies					
consumable					
non-consumable					
Instructional					
Prof. Salaries					
Para-Prof. Salaries					
Equipment (depreciation)					
Materials & Supplies					
consumable					
non-consumable					
Testing & Measurement					
Salaries					
Materials & Supplies					
consumable					
non-consumable					
TOTALS					

* Estimate of costs which would re-occur if contractor operated similar program at similar size next year.

** Unique developmental costs are those non-allowable costs of the contractor which will be amortized over this project; non-unique are those to be amortized over a larger number of projects.

ATTACHMENT IV

PROPOSAL SELECTION CRITERIA

I. General Features of the Proposal

A. Presentation and Organization

1. Did the contractor follow DISD guidelines for proposal format and organization?

2. Are budgets and pricing arrangements presented according to DISD guidelines?

3. Is there an inherent logic to the organization of the individual sections?

4. Are there distracting errors, typographical or grammatical?

5. Is size and bulk a substitute for quality?

B. Stylistic

1. Is the writing lucid yet to the point?

2. Is the narrative unnecessarily interspersed with "gingerbread", i.e. unrelated photographs, diagrams, digressions, ets.?

3. Is there an attempt to capture the reader's sympathy through over-blown rhetoric, unnecessary praise, etc?

4. Are deviations from the RFP or weak points glossed over?

II. Soundness of Approach

A. Technical

1. Theoretical/conceptual basis

2. Pertinent and valid empirical data

3. Field tested material and techniques

4. Behavior psychology basis

B. Socio-Political/Technical

1. Will the community accept?

2. Will the schools accept?

3. Ease of turnkey.

C. General Factors

1. Degree of non-labor intensity, i.e., low operating costs

2. Extent to which instruction is individualized

3. Testing instruments proposed and accompanying rationale

4. Plan for training local personnel (both consultants and para-professionals)

5. Motivational techniques proposed

6. Management and logistical plan

7. Provisions for quality control and on-going internal evaluation

8. Range and flexibility of instructional time per day

9. Difficulty of transition of mid-year student transfer from Learning Center Achievement to school system.

III. Most Favorable Pricing Arrangement

A. Acceptable methods of cost reimbursement

B. Account Costs broken into following categories:

1. Start-up

2. Capital outlay

3. Operating, actual and opportunity

C. Cost per unit achievement for students with different learning profiles

IV. Past Performance and Technical Ability

A. Relevance of past performance

B. Verification by check with previous consumers, clients, users, associates, etc.

C. Personnel

1. Managerial expertise

2. Background in behavioral science and instruction

V. Organizational Commitment

A. High level corporate support

B. Investment of time and other resources in planning proposal

C. Corporate attitude toward the project

D. If consortium, clarity of lines of responsibility drawn

E. Extent of "other" operations and over-commitment

F. Ability to perform on "extras"

1. Social services
2. Other instructional services
3. Counseling and guidance services
4. GED - basic education
5. "Operation Catch-Up"
6. "Special Education"

VI. Other Factors

A. Hardware technology

1. Cost-effectiveness of technical operations
2. Availability through GSA or mass procurement sources
3. Delivery time and guarantees
4. Maintenance, re-installation, parts, and repairs
5. Flexibility to use various kinds and forms of software and conceptual materials
6. Adaptability to modified classroom environments

ADDENDUM TO RFP

Texarkana, USA participates in the "Model Cities" program funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The educational component of the Model Cities program desires to assist the Texarkana, Arkansas School District to implement the Dropout Prevention Program in to the elementary schools. The overall goals for this program are similar to those described in the RFP. The contractor selected to provide in instructional program for the School District's Title VIII, ESEA Dropout Prevention Program will also be awarded the contract to provide the instructional program in the elementary school. The purpose of this addendum is to outline the statement of work for this segment of the Dropout Prevention Program.

I. Performance Required

A. The contractor shall be required to maximize student achievement for an estimated 250 sixth-grade students who are deficient two or more grade levels in reading and/or mathematics. The contractor shall operate under the following time and costs constraints:

1. The student will be available to the contractor for 45 to 60 minutes per day per subject matter area.
2. The student will be available to the contractor for a maximum of 150 days.

B. The contractor shall guarantee that not more than five per cent of the students enrolled in the program will drop out of the program during the school year. The definition of a program dropout and compensations and penalties for such students are outlined in the special provisions section.

II. Measurement of Performance

"Same as in RFP."

III. Method of Contractor Reimbursement

"Same as in RFP except a separate Format for reporting formula payment should

be made for this segment of the program."

IV. General Conditions

"Same as in RFP except where reference is made to Secondary students or schools substitute elementary."

V. Special Conditions

"Same as in RFP with following exceptions."

1. Where reference is made to secondary students or schools, the word elementary should be substituted.
2. The target population for this program are all students in the Texarkana, Arkansas schools who are two or more grade levels deficient in reading and/or mathematics and who have an IQ of 75 or higher on an intelligence test.
3. The contractor shall establish learning centers at those schools designated by the LEA.